

**AUG 01 2006**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

CESAR TADEO MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-70999

Agency No. A95-605-020

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Cesar Tadeo Martinez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

immigration judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal.

We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review Martinez's contention that he was denied a full and fair hearing because he failed to raise it before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (noting that due process challenges that are "procedural in nature" must be exhausted).

Martinez's contention that the agency deprived him of due process by misapplying the law to the facts of his case does not state a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction."); *see also Sanchez-Cruz v. INS*, 255 F.3d 775, 779 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that the "misapplication of case law" may not be reviewed).

Further, contrary to Martinez's contention, the agency's interpretation of the hardship standard falls within the broad range authorized by the statute. *See Ramirez-Perez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 1001, 1004-06 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**